

REMARKS

I. Comments on Examiner's Statement of "Reasons for Allowance"

In the Examiner's statement of "Reasons for Allowance," the Examiner states that the term "privacy-related action" is defined on page 4 of the specification, paragraph 2, which reads as follows:

The rules model is based on a limited set of privacy-related actions: access, disclose, release, notify, utilize, update, withdraw consent, give consent, delete, anonymize, depersonalize and repersonalize. These actions are related to services provided by the Data Subject (in the case of release or give consent), a Party (in the case of notify), or a Data User (all the other actions). Authorization for an action is obtained by calling the corresponding get_X_Auth actions (getAccessAuth, getDiscloseAuth,...) on the relevant Filled Form. This authorization is granted or denied, depending on the relevant rules in the Filled Form. Besides grant or denial of authorization, the outcome may include an obligation or suggestion to do some additional task.

While this section of the specification does give examples of privacy related actions that may be used in an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, the claims are not limited to the exemplary privacy-related actions set forth in the example embodiment described on page 4 of the present specification. In fact, the independent claims do not recite any of the specific actions set forth on page 4, paragraph 2 but instead only reference privacy-related actions. While the term "privacy-related actions" may indeed encompass those actions specifically set forth on page 4, paragraph 2, the term is broad enough to cover other privacy-related actions as well.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is improperly reading in limitations from the specification into the claims. The invention as recited in the independent claims is not limited to only privacy-related actions selected from the list of access, disclose, release, notify, utilize, update, withdraw consent, give consent, delete, anonymize, depersonalize and repersonalize. Furthermore, the invention as recited in the independent claims does not require that all of these listed privacy-related actions be present in the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner states that the independent claims “explicitly” include the actions of disclose, release, notify, utilize, update, withdraw consent, give consent, delete, anonymize, depersonalize, and repersonalize. None of these actions are explicitly recited in any of the claims. To the contrary, the claims recite “privacy-related actions” which may include one or more of such actions, but just as well may include other privacy-related actions in addition to, or in replacement of, one or more of these actions listed in the specification. Thus, the Examiner’s statement that the claims “explicitly” recite these actions is simply erroneous. The claims neither explicitly nor implicitly recite these actions, despite the allegations of the Examiner.


It should be noted that Applicants’ argument, submitted with the Preliminary Amendment filed August 23, 2005, states that Kido does not teach or suggest the features of (1) constructing a rule for each of said privacy-related actions, wherein each rule defines an action corresponding to an associated privacy-related action, a logical condition that identifies a condition under which a particular decision is generated, and a decision indicating a manner by which said associated privacy-related action is to be performed; (2) determining if said set of rules includes at least one rule having an action corresponding to an action specified in the request, a condition that evaluates to “true,” and a decision that indicates that the action is authorized; or (3) selecting a rule in the set of rules that has an action corresponding to said action specified in the request, said condition that evaluates to “true,” and said decision that indicates that the action is authorized and providing an output based on selecting said rule in the set of rules. It is for these reasons that the present claims are allowable, not the reading in of limitations from the specification, as asserted by the Examiner in the “Reasons for Allowance.”

II. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Applicants disagree with the Examiner's Reasons for Allowance. To the contrary, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over the prior art of record for the enumerated reasons above.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: December 13, 2005



Stephen J. Walder, Jr.

Reg. No. 41,534

WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.

P.O. Box 832745

Richardson, TX 75083

(214) 722-6419

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS